

Virginia Social Services System
Strategic Plan – Goal 3 Steering Committee Meeting
Wednesday, March 14, 2007
9:30 AM – 4:00 PM
Hanover Department of Social Services

“Improve business productivity through effective automation”

Attendees: Ms. Judy English, Ms. Dottie Wells, Mr. Harry Sutton, Ms. Jan Selbo, Mr. Hubert Harris, Mr. Tom Little, Ms. Sarah Linder, Mr. Dennis Shearin, Mr. Eddie Harrison, Mr. Don Rainey, Ms. Mary Jo Thomas, Ms. Patty Taylor, Mr. Morris Campbell, Ms. Zandra Relaford, Ms. Susan Rackley (scribe)

Action Items:

1. Morris Campbell, Eddie Harrison, Zandra Relaford will work together to add new language to address the exchange of data, consumer confidentiality, service issues, flexible systems to address flexible teams. The team was also charged with the task of simplifying and clarifying the “Vision”. The committee was asked to send suggestions for any of these changes to Morris for consideration.
2. The Goal 3 Committee will establish a work group, drawing upon those who participated in the Data Sharing Work Group, other interested parties, and this Goal 3 Committee to make concrete recommendations for design, rules, and formatting regarding data sharing.
3. Morris Campbell will request agencies to submit proposals for tele-working. There may be a window of opportunity to complete a pilot for tele-working prior to the VITA refresh and potentially enough time to seek budget appropriation for more funding before the deadline for submitting new budget requests. Morris Campbell, Harry Sutton, Dennis Shearin and Don Rainey will formulate a recommendation for the pilot.
4. Harry will distribute the URL for a prototype of a reporting portal.
5. Establish the Goal 3 Committee as the Enterprise Steering Committee.

Dottie Wells welcomed everyone and introduced Zandra Relaford who is the new Strategic Planning champion for Dottie’s team.

The goal of this committee is to “Improve business productivity through effective automation”. The Virginia Social Services System (VSSS) is entering into a 5-year strategic plan, beginning SFY08 (7/1/07). A new member questioned the purpose of the

Goal 3 Committee. This committee supports and provides direction to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee regarding IT issues. It makes recommendations on IT matters. The Commissioner has the final authority to make IT decisions based on those recommendations.

The focus of this meeting is to strategize the direction of this committee to support the stated goal. Questions we want to ask:

- Which directions should we be headed?
- What are the objectives that need to be met?
- How will we as a committee work toward meeting these objectives?
- What resources are necessary to meet the objectives?

As part of the retreat, 4 documents were handed out to be discussed and provide input for the work of the Goal 3 committee:

1. The “Vision for a New Business Automation Model for Consumer Services in the Virginia Social Services System” document
2. The Enterprise Information Management (EIM) Work Group Recommendations for all of the work groups
3. A list of the major Business Process Reengineering Project recommendations that require IT changes
4. The list of current major IT projects through the Division of Information Systems

The “Vision” statement (**copy attached**) was approved in March 2006. It described a system which had one entry for all Human Services assistance. It described “doors” which are locations other than LDSS where citizens could apply for all types of assistance, i.e. libraries, community agencies, home computers, etc. Reaffirm and redefine the common vision. The committee members discussed the strengths and shortcomings of the vision document. It contains a list of the benefits of this model system, but the vision does not articulate the entire picture and there are unanswered issues:

- The issue of security and confidentiality is not addressed. How does the consumer remain in control of his/her information?
- Issues surrounding the Service side of the house lack attention in the vision document. The question was asked: “Do you ever envision a true generic worker who will determine eligibility for benefits as well as provide services”? The consensus was that this reality would be extremely difficult as a standard model, due to the differences in job functions and skill sets between eligibility and services. However, this committee needs to focus on providing the technology necessary to be able to access data necessary to do the job, whatever that job is.
- Regulated capabilities, standards for data storage need to be available statewide, but include the flexibility for LDSS to add tools, etc. needed in their localities.
- Are all of the parts of the VSSS identified in the vision document? An example would be DCSE – what does the vision mean to their work?
- The vision does not address the exchange of data between local agencies and State systems.

Morris Campbell, Eddie Harrison, Zandra Relaford volunteered to work together revise the "vision" to add new language that addresses data exchange, consumer confidentiality, service issues, and flexible teams. The committee was asked to send suggestions for any of these changes to Morris for consideration.

This committee is re-focusing and re-energizing. In the past, the committee really has not defined steps to get to our stated goal. The committee needs to gather consensus between LDSS and the State and develop the attainable steps that lead to the goal. It needs to identify other opportunities that will take little or no resources to accomplish but serve to further the goal. It needs to find other ways of doing what needs to be done. We also need to take note of larger issues that will require more energy and resources.

So, where are we headed? What is this idea of an Integrated Social Services Delivery System (ISSDS)? Morris described his idea of a single data repository used as a portal to access all the other systems. That is the basis of the ISSDS model. Although the Department did not receive any funding to go forward with the ISSDS as a single effort, the vision of an integrated system still holds true. What does this committee need to do to ensure that VSSS keeps heading in this direction?

From the discussion of the vision, the committee then reviewed the recommendations from the EIM Work Groups.

- The Imaging Work Group recommendations (**copy attached**) addressed the issue of data sharing. Some agencies have this capability, some do not, and some are in the process of developing it. Recommendations for the indexing of data so it can be easily retrieved as well as the ability to capture, store and retrieve data agency to agency were included. Harry stated that Barbra Caris is a member of the State Enterprise Content Management (ECM) committee that is receiving RFP's for imaging and integrator vendors, and she worked to ensure that language in the RFP reflects the recommendations from the Enterprise Work Group. DEQ has funding to move forward with ECM and will proceed with an ECM system. Harry suggested we may want to begin standardizing imaging and indexing to facilitate this process though no additional funding from the state has been provided for this effort.
- The Data Sharing Work Group's recommendations (**copy attached**) were similar to the Goal 3 committee's discussion regarding flexibility. There is a recommendation to create a common repository and standards for data sharing and a global simplified sign-on. Data ownership is discussed. Ownership of data is very important to the concept of a data repository. This issue needs to be resolved before a front-end repository is utilized. There was concurrence that standards related to data exchange applications need to be developed, including flexibility to use whatever applications that meet those standards, and take into account any Federal requirements for data exchange

- The Business Process Views Work Group developed recommendations (**copy attached**) in 3 areas:
 - *Common/Core Demographics* used by everyone and with when data is displayed, when, what, and how it is displayed; this group recommended a central demographic data repository to reduce duplicative data entry. They also recommended a single sign-on for local workers to access all systems. The group did not address differing levels of authority to change data in the system of record and data depository, nor did they make any specific recommendations regarding the ability of other agencies to access VSSS data and make changes.
 - *Virtual Work Environments* for development of policies and systems; and could replace the practice of e-mailing documents to several people for review. The application could be accessed from anywhere. Per Harry Sutton, SharePoint is an application that allows multiple people to access a certain point, i.e. shared comments, posted notice, etc. that might be used for this purpose.
 - *Mobility & Tele-work* for employees working remotely or tele-working and still be accessible for meetings via the virtual work environment application. Harry pointed out that the VITA refresh of PC equipment is due to begin after the first of the year. If local departments are considering permitting some of their workforce to telecommute, they may decide to move from desktops to laptops. This could increase the DIS budget by \$5M per year. Dottie knows at least one agency who would like to replace most desktops with laptops. Would this be a good initiative for the Goal 3 committee to pursue as a pilot? There is a potential window of opportunity to complete a pilot prior to the VITA refresh and with enough time to seek budget appropriation for more funding by the deadline for submitting new budget requests. Morris Campbell, Harry Sutton, Dennis Shearin and Don Rainey will formulate a recommendation for the pilot.
- The User Information Access & Reporting Work group recommended (**copy attached**) one portal for creating reports for DSS. Harry will distribute the URL for a prototype of a reporting portal. A discussion ensued regarding the accessibility of reports. Many reports currently available do not have descriptions attached. Judy recommended the reports be available without a description and publicize the fact that the descriptions will be forthcoming. This way, if someone needs a report and knows which one it is, they can readily access it through the single portal. This could be accomplished quickly, and may be a “quick win” initiative.
- The Enterprise Case Management Work Group recommendations (**copy attached**) looked across program areas to find common functions. This is the model for the ISSDS. This work group made recommendations regarding case management and work flows.

Conceptually all of the work group recommendations are in line with Goal 3. And, the work group recommendations also support the BPR model. However, there have been

some changes in IT development and some priorities have shifted since the BPR model was first developed. Some of the current IT priorities were never envisioned within BPR, yet they require resources. The Department's executive level management has endorsed the BPR model conceptually, but has not endorsed all of the individual changes that would be required to support the model.

In addition, trust levels are not where they need to be between LDSS and the State. Trust levels will need to be raised before many of the BPR recommendations can be implemented. The Department has the responsibility to choose which recommendations will be supported with Department resources. Not all recommendations will be chosen. Financial and procurement issues may be reviewed in light of the BPR recommendations.

The discussion of current IT projects covered items that are considered mandated (direction from the federal partners or an APA finding), as well as those items that generally support either the work group recommendations or the BPR model. Most of projects in the Benefit Programs area are mandated. Family Services is working on SACWIS compliance with the exception of ASAPS. The database administration group is proceeding with enhancements to SPIDeR. Other parts of DIS are working on APA findings, security issues and providing web services and system maintenance.

An additional handout was a very rough spreadsheet that:

- 1) tracks the BPR IT recommendation,
- 2) checks whether it was considered a high, medium or low priority,
- 3) checks whether it is reflected in the "Vision" document either explicitly or implicitly, and
- 4) checks whether it appears as one of the recommendations from the work groups, and/or
- 5) it is a current IT project

We will probably expand this spreadsheet to include the annual ITIM plans of the Benefits, Business Intelligence, Family Services and DCSE steering committees.

From all of this information, the committee then identified "hot button" issues and potential strategic initiatives that could feed into the direction that Goal 3 is going. In addition, because there are so many IT issues that cross programmatic and system areas, we need to establish an Enterprise Steering Committee. The Goal 3 Committee has representatives from all the areas that would comprise an Enterprise Steering Committee, so the plan is to use the Goal 3 Committee as the Enterprise Steering Committee.

Data sharing and a front-end repository were identified as "hot button" issues for the Goal 3 Committee. Strategically, we cannot get very far in creating an ISSDS before we resolve these items. As an action item, this group will establish a work group, drawing upon those who participated in the Data Sharing Work Group, other interested parties, and this Goal 3 Committee to make concrete recommendations for design, rules, and formatting. As part of data sharing, this group will also make recommendations around who owns the data and who can change the core data elements that might appear in a front-end data repository.

The MAPPER conversion project is a strategic initiative that will require time and resources. There may be “quick wins” that can be accomplished within ADAPT prior to changes being frozen during the conversion. The conversion project will last approximately 22 months once final approval is given and work begins.

There were several “hot button” issues that were identified. They were originally grouped into State issues and Local issues. However, after some discussion, it was decided that they are all issues for all of us.

- MAPPER conversion
- SACWIS compliance
- Child Care project - \$750,000 in budget for start-up
- VITA – substantial investment of time and money
- ADAPT-ABD Medicaid
- Document management
- Customer relations management

Potential tactical steps that support the direction of Goal 3 and may also be “quick wins” are:

- Develop a reports portal
- Pilot a telecommuting project
- Pilot a virtual work environment
- Pool funding to supplement resources from the State to develop applications that better serve local needs
- Evaluate small initiatives for inclusion in ADAPT prior to freeze

Next Steps

The next meeting of Goal 3 will be another all day meeting from 9:30 till 4:00 on April 5 at the Central Regional office (VISSTA Training Center). At this meeting, we will finish our discussion of the background information and begin to develop objectives and strategies for our Goal 3.

If you cannot make the entire day (as I know both Lynette and Vicky has Family Services Steering Committee in the afternoon, please come for whatever portion you can.

Please email Dottie to let her know if you plan to attend, as lunch will be ordered.